



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.—BEGINNING OF THE GREEK DAY.

The statement of Varro that the Athenians reckoned the day from sunset to sunset has been questioned by Gustav Bilfinger, *Der bürgerliche Tag*, Stuttgart, 1888, but the result of his work has been rejected both by Mommsen, *Neuere Schriften ueber die attische Zeitrechnung*, Phil. LXI pp. 201 ff. and by Unger in his article on Chronologie in Mueller's *Handbuch d. klass. Altertums-Wissenschaft* I.² p. 715. In these places, however, are quoted from Homer, although Unger is to some extent striving for completeness, ("Wir fügen, weil gewöhnlich bloss die homerische Stelle [i. e. T 141] angeführt wird, einige Belege an") only the single passage T 141, and as far as I can judge from Mommsen's summary, Bilfinger—his work is unfortunately not accessible—referred to no other.¹ I am convinced, however, that there are in the Homeric poems a number of passages that must be interpreted on the basis of this method of reckoning the day, and the matter gains in importance because when such passages are interpreted on the basis of a day beginning with sunrise inconsistencies are brought into the poems, which are in turn used as a basis for the solution of the question of their composition. Thus Croiset, not realizing that for a Greek speaking before breakfast "yesterday" would include what we would call "night before last," finds the passage already cited at variance with the preceding books of the *Iliad* and says (*Hist. de la Litt. Grecque*, I p. 154): "Ce détail indique peut-être qu'au moment où la *Réconciliation* a été composée l'*Iliade* n'était pas encore complètement formée et que par suite la chronologie des événements n'y était pas fixée comme elle l'est aujourd'hui." Apparently he does not notice that this involves the further assumption of a plot entirely different from that of our *Iliad*, for *Embassy* and *Reconciliation* can be brought on ensuing night and morning only by means of some such hypothesis as that of Valetton, *Ad compositionem Iliadis*, Mnem. XXIII pp. 390-454,

¹ In Phil. LI. 20-22, Unger discusses also Ω 414, which, however, is concerned only with the natural day.

according to which the *Embassy* was successful and the *Reconciliation* brought about before the death of Patroclus, but which is rejected by Cauer, Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, 1902, p. 10, as violent and arbitrary. Consequently, unless one is willing to go to such an extreme, he must accept the conclusion of the scholiast, φαίνεται οὖν εἰδὼς προὔπουσάσαν τὴν νύκτα τῆς ἡμέρας, which brings this line into harmony with the plan of the *Iliad* as we now have it.

The chief difficulty that has been found in the account of Odysseus' stay among the Phaeacians arises from a similar misinterpretation of αὔριον. The difficulty may be stated in the words of Croiset, op. cit. p. 272 f. (cf. also Kirchhoff, *Die homerische Odyssee*, p. 211): "Tout d'abord le début même de ce récit, par certaines maladroites évidentes, trahit un raccord. Puis Alkinoos promet par deux fois à Ulysse de le faire reconduire chez lui le lendemain matin (VII, 189-191 et 318). Or en réalité Ulysse passera chez les Phéaciens toute la journée du lendemain à des jeux, il emploiera la nuit suivante en récits, et en définitive ne partira que le surlendemain soir, sans que ce retard s'explique d'aucune manière. Il paraît donc certain que cette partie du poème a dû être allongée." Now, without wishing to argue for the unity of composition of this part of the *Odyssey*, I wish to call attention to the fact that this difficulty disappears as soon as the day is reckoned from sunset to sunset. The first promise made to Odysseus by Alkinoos (η 189 ff.) is simply that on the following morning ἡώθεν he will call the princes of the Phaeacians, hold feast and sacrifice, and then consider the question of Odysseus' return. Later, after the hero has made a more favorable impression, Alkinoos fixes the time of his return (ι. 318) αὔριον ἐς without waiting to refer the matter to the council. Properly interpreted, this means that Odysseus shall pass the ensuing (natural) day in Scheria and shall be sent home sometime between the first and second sunsets. On the following night, however (i. e. before this time has elapsed), his identity is discovered, and Alkinoos asks that his guest will not hold him to his promise but will (λ 351) remain until the (Greek) to-morrow.

Note what follows. The feast goes on the next day:

ν 28 :

αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς

πολλὰ πρὸς ἥελιον κεφαλὴν τρέπε παμφανόωντα,
δύναι ἐπειγόμενος· δὴ γὰρ μενέαινε νέεσθαι κτέ.

That is, the setting of the sun marks the beginning of a new day, the earliest moment at which Odysseus might claim that the time for his return had come. The objection may be raised that Odysseus made no such claim on the preceding evening at sunset, but the reason for this is to be found in the different forms of the two promises. Alkinoos' promise was to send Odysseus home on a certain day, and it would have been too great importunity on the part of Odysseus to demand that this promise be fulfilled the moment the day began. Such importunity on the part of an unknown stranger, even though he was evidently a man of worth, might very well have encountered a rebuff, and to urge such a request at the moment (*θ* 417) when the princes of the Phaeacians were bringing him gifts would have been to act with a tactlessness of which Odysseus could never have been guilty. On the following day the conditions were very different. He was known as a famous hero, he had promised to stay until a certain day, and the moment that that day came he had a right to rise and say, "I have kept my promise, the time for my departure has come."

In the other passages in the *Odyssey* in which *αὔριον* occurs (*α* 272, *σ* 23) it is used before sunset with reference to the ensuing (natural) day, so that the passages are not of service for the present question.

In the ninth book of the *Iliad* Achilles says :

I 357: αὔριον ἱρὰ Διὶ βέξας καὶ πᾶσι θεοῖσι
 νήσας ἐν νῆας, ἐπὴν ἄλαδε προερίσσω
 δψεαι, αἱ κ' ἐθέλῃσθα καὶ αἱ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλη,
 ἦρι μάλ' Ἑλλήσποντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα πλεούσας
 νῆας ἐμάς.

Leaf in his translation connects *αὔριον* and *βέξας*. The same interpretation is implied by van Leeuwen's emendation, *νῆα ἐμὴν* for *νήας ἐπήν*. Even if this were correct, as *ἦρι μάλ᾽α* must refer to the same time, it does not remove the difficulty, that Achilles is made to threaten, according to the usual interpretation, to perform sacrifice, launch and load his ships, and still start very early the next morning—a physical impossibility. As a matter of fact, *αὔριον* modifies *δψεαι*, the meaning darting along the beginning of the lines *αὔριον . . . δψεαι . . . ἦρι μάλ(α) . . . νῆας ἐμάς*. Achilles' threat, then, is (in our terminology) to spend the next day in preparation and sail early the following morning.

This is perfectly feasible and is not contradicted by line 682, where Odysseus reports that Achilles has threatened to make on the following morning the first preparation for his departure, the launching of his ships.

This view of the situation removes one very serious difficulty in the plot of the Iliad and, at first sight, seems to introduce another. The presence of Achilles in the Greek camp on the following day is at variance with his threat as usually interpreted, and it is generally assumed that during the Embassy he changed his intention, the change being subtly indicated in 601, 619, 650, although Odysseus in his report makes no allusion to such a change of purpose, and the staying of Phoenix with Achilles implies the contrary. When *αἶριον* is interpreted in accordance with Varro's statement this hypothesis of a change of purpose is no longer necessary,¹ and an examination of the three passages cited will show that they do not establish it, and so the plan of Achilles remains what Odysseus reports it to be. The trouble in 650 is that more meaning is read into *πρὶν* than is warranted. Cf. the literature cited in An Epic Fragment from Oxyrhynchus, A. J. P. XXII p. 66. Achilles simply says that he will not fight before Hector comes to the huts of the Myrmidons, without implying that this will ever happen or ever can happen, and so Odysseus understood him, though the suggestion of the idea leads Achilles' fiery spirit to develop its consequences. Line 619 is simply a polite way of telling Phoenix to drop the subject and the promise to discuss it again on the following morning *ἀμα δ' ἡοὶ φαινομένηφι* makes no difficulty when we remember that that time is twenty-four hours before the time of sailing. In line 601 Phoenix does seem to imply that Achilles will not leave. It may very well be that he is simply assuming the point he wishes to gain, but it must be remembered that this line is wound up with the Meleagros incident, which is one of, if not the latest, addition to the book, and it is possibly merely a thoughtless adaptation of what actually occurred.

The difficulty that my interpretation seems to raise is that if Achilles is not to sail on the following morning there is no reason why Phoenix should pass the night in his hut. In reply it might be urged that Phoenix is generally considered an intruder, and

¹ The threat is purposely so worded as to leave time on the next day for the intervention of Patroclus and its fatal consequences. That is the author of this book had before him the nucleus, at least, of the Patrocleia.

that the lack of skill shown in getting him off the scene is simply another indication of this fact. But when attention is once drawn to the absurdity of Phoenix's staying in the hut of Achilles in order to be ready to start with him thirty-six hours later—his action always involved his starting without bag or baggage—suspicion is directed towards ll. 427 ff. = 690 ff., and as both the speeches of Achilles and Odysseus clearly gain by the removal of the concluding lines, I was led by the absurdity of the way in which Phoenix is forced to remain in the hut of Achilles to the hypothesis that in the original version of the *Embassy* he was not one of Agamemnon's envoys, but present as an attendant of Achilles.

After I had already satisfied myself that this hypothesis would account for the difficulties connected with Phoenix and was preferable to the general and more radical view, that Phoenix was an entire stranger to the original version of the *Embassy*, I learned from Bursian's *Jahresb.*, 1902, p. 14, that a similar hypothesis had already been advocated by J. Schultz, *Zur Ilias-Kritik*, Berlin, 1900 (unfortunately inaccessible), in such a way as to gain the approbation of Cauer. I will therefore merely state briefly what seem to me the merits of this hypothesis. It seems impossible to believe that the author of the speeches of Odysseus and Achilles could have been so poor in invention as to attempt no reply to Achilles except Ajax's abandonment of the situation. Equally impossible is it to imagine anything more appropriate than Phoenix's speech (less the Meleagros incident, 523-602) and Achilles' reply, especially when we consider how Phoenix's speech gains in effectiveness as coming not from an envoy of Agamemnon but from a comrade of Achilles, and how well its tone and the tone of Achilles' reply are adapted to this view. Finally, the alterations necessary to restore this condition are in part the same as those usually proposed in part much less radical. In the first place, 168 must be expunged and the beginning of 169 remodelled as on the usual hypothesis. This does away with the difficulty caused by the presence of Phoenix in the council and justifies the use of the dual in 182-98. In 223 the name of Phoenix, as Leaf remarks, "has been awkwardly dragged in to remind us of his existence"; the line may be rewritten, as Leaf suggests:

νεῦσ' Αἴας Ὀδυσῆν· ὁ δὲ φρεσὶν ἦσι νόησας,

or more simply :

νεῦσ' Αἰας σιγῇ· ἐνόησε δὲ διος Ὀδυσσεύς.

Then, instead of having to abandon, as Leaf at 168 does, the whole episode, 432–622 (other parts, e. g. 427–9 = 690 ff., would have to go with it) we have only to reject 427–9, then in 432–3 we find Phoenix suitably introduced and the motif for his speech given. Then all runs smooth (apart from the Meleagros story) until we come to 617–8, out of which must be made one line:

οὔτοι δ' ἀγγελέουσ'· ἅμα δ' ἡοῖ φαινομένηφι,

and in 621 some such word as *ὀτραλέως* is to be substituted for *Φοίνικι*, Achilles' hint becoming much more pointed. The same change is to be made in 659, and 662 is to be expunged, with alteration of the beginning of the next line, unless this whole section is a later addition, and finally 690 ff. = 427 ff. are to be removed. All these passages refer to Phoenix's night's rest and have to go according to the usual view. The cause of these alterations is not far to seek. Some one misunderstanding 190 f., and believing that only an envoy of Agamemnon would speak for Agamemnon, proceeded to make Phoenix an envoy; then, not wishing to separate him from Achilles and taking the hint from 437, hit upon the idea of putting him to bed in order that he might be ready to return with Achilles. The expedient was in truth a stupid one, but not worse than others in the *Odyssey* that have been pointed out by Kirchhoff. The narrative as it now stands is impossible, and the above hypothesis seems to me better than the entire rejection of everything relating to Phoenix. In either case, however, no objection from this source can be made to the interpretation of *αἴριον* in 357 that I have proposed.

To these four passages in which *χθιὺς* and *αἴριον* clearly imply that the day is reckoned from sunset to sunset must be added the fact that in a number of other cases where, speaking after sunset, one wishes to refer to the ensuing morning *αἴριον* is not used but *ἡῶθεν* H 372, Ψ 49, Ω 401. α 372, γ 366, δ 214, η 189, μ 293, ξ 512, ο 308, τ 320; *ἡῶθι* πρὸ ζ 36; *ἡοῦς* Θ 470, 525 (cf. Leaf's note, however); *μέσφ' ἡοῦς* Θ 508; *ἄμ' ἡοῖ* H 331; *ἄμ' ἡοῖ φαινομένηφι* I 618, 682, Ω 600, ζ 31, η 222, ο 396, π 270. It is hardly necessary to add that the fact that these phrases are also used (Σ 136, ο 506, ρ 600, σ 248, φ 265, 280, δ 407, μ 24) before sunset does

not weaken the force of the argument. These words simply mean in "the morning", and the idea of futurity in the context specializes this meaning to "the coming morning" without implying whether that belongs to "to-day" or "to-morrow." The point is that in these twenty-three passages we might say "to-morrow," but the Greek has said "in the morning," presumably because *αὔριον* would have meant a different thing.

There remain for consideration three passages in which *αὔριον* is used after sunset with reference to the ensuing day. The material already examined is in my opinion sufficient to show that such an use must be the result of the unthinking approximation of originally diverse materials, and an examination of these passages will sustain this conclusion. Two of the examples are Θ 535 and 538. The whole of this book is a mosaic, and no part betrays this origin more clearly than this closing part of Hector's speech, cf. Leaf at 524. The instance in 538 is not even textually certain, as Nauck's conjecture *οὐρανόν* is attractive, while 535 was omitted by Zenodotos, and Aristarchus considered 535-7 an inferior parallel to 538-41. Under these circumstances there can be little doubt that the lines were adapted from a source in which *αὔριον* had its proper meaning. It may be noted that line 541 as it stands serves to confirm the theory that the day began with sunset. The criticism directed against it is practically 'Hector says "to-day" and means "to-morrow":' but in this case our "to-morrow" is the Greek "to-day." The line, however, seems taken from N 828, in which context it throws no light upon the subject.

That two out of three apparent exceptions stand in such a context must serve to cast suspicion on the third, Σ 269. The passage is not improbably a late working out of a suggestion in X 100-104, cf. Croiset, *op. cit.*, p. 151, and it may be that this is simply the result of unskilful adaptation of material composed for another context. If a more definite suggestion is desired, Polydamas' speech would be satisfactory if made before sunset, and it may have been that originally the battle was terminated simply by the appearance of Achilles. Hera's making the sun set after the consternation that Achilles had caused seems rather an act of supererogation—not to mention that her interference after the events of the afternoon and the submissiveness of the sungod are both surprising—and served, according to Polydamas, only to impede Achilles and to give the Trojans time to save

themselves by flight. The words *νῦν μὲν νύξ ἀπέπαυσε ποδώκεα Πηλείωνα* may have been added to Polydamas' speech after the account of the setting of the sun had been inserted, or they may have meant originally only that night was so near that Achilles did not begin a counter attack for that reason, and themselves have been the cause of the insertion.

In view of these facts I think the conclusion is warranted that throughout the time of the composition of the Homeric poems the day was reckoned, as Varro says the Athenians reckoned it, from sunset to sunset, and that the only passages which seem to imply another mode of reckoning are all the result of the thoughtless adaptation of phrases from a context in which they must have been rightly employed.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.